IV. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed November 3, 2004. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-22 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 and 10-22 and objected to claim 9. The present response contains no amendments, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-22. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

1. Specification

Although the Examiner made no objection to the specification, Applicants have amended the specification for greater definiteness.

2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Normile (U.S. Patent 5,872,865; hereafter, "*Normile*"). Claims 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Normile*. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Normile*, in view of Mauldin (U.S. Patent 5,664,227; hereafter, "*Mauldin*"). Claim 9 was objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim 1, but was stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over *Normile*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. It is respectfully submitted that the references cited in the Office Action, including *Normile* and *Mauldin*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. *Normile* discloses a computer system and computer implemented method [to] automatically classify video sequences into categories. *Normile* further discloses that a set of categories is defined either manually through the association of selected video sequences with user supplied category designations, or automatically through segregation of a set of video sequences into groups of similar sequences. Claim 1, by contrast,

discloses that optimal summaries of a linear media source are automatically produced by parameterizing a linear media source. Claim 1 also discloses that the parameterized linear media source is used to create a similarity array in which each array element includes the value of a similarity measurement between a two portions of the parameterized media signal. Claim 1 further discloses that a segment fitness function, adapted for measuring the similarity between a segment of the parameterized media signal and the entire parameterized media signal, is optimized to find an optimal segment location. Claim 1 further discloses that a portion of the linear media source corresponding to the optimal segment location is selected as the optimal summary.

The references cited in the Office Action, including *Normile* and *Mauldin*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Neither *Normile* nor *Mauldin*, considered alone or in combination, discloses that optimal summaries of a linear media source are automatically produced, let alone that optimal summaries of a linear media source are automatically produced by parameterizing a linear media source to produce a parameterized media signal. In short, *Normile* (column 6, lines 35-41) teaches parameterizing an *entire* video sequence by "average[ing]...all frames in the video sequence." By contrast, Claim 1 teaches parameterizing *portions* of a single video sequence. The teachings of *Normile* will fail for a single video sequence.

Similarly, neither *Normile* nor *Mauldin*, considered alone or in combination, discloses that the parameterized linear media source is used to create a similarity array in which each array element includes the value of a similarity measurement between a two portions of the parameterized media signal. *Normile* (column 6, lines 39-54) discloses clustering video shots in a vector space, which has nothing to do with the claimed similarity array comprised of a plurality of array elements.

Moreover, neither *Normile* nor *Mauldin*, considered alone or in combination, discloses a segment fitness function, let alone optimizing the value of a segment fitness function. Finally, neither *Normile* nor *Mauldin*, considered alone or in combination, discloses that a portion of the linear media source corresponding to the optimal segment location is selected as the optimal summary. The high energy eigenvectors disclosed by the cited section of *Normile* (column 7, lines 27-44) bear no relationship to selection of a portion of a media source based

on optimality. Claims 2-22 each ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-22 are believed patentable over the cited references and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

V. CONCLUSION

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of the patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/3/05

By: _____
J. Steven Svoboda
Registration No. 44,366

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
e-mail: jss@fdml.com